arXiv:1403.0888v2 [math.RA] 30 Dec 2014

$\mathbb{Z}_2$-GRADED IDENTITIES OF THE GRASSMANN ALGEBRA OVER A FINITE FIELD

LUÍS FELIPE GONÇALVES FONSECA

Abstract. Let F be a finite field with characteristic $p > 2$ and let G be the unitary Grassmann algebra generated by an infinite dimensional vector space V over F. In this paper, we determine a basis of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded polynomial identities for any non-trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading such that a basis of V is homogeneous in this grading.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 16R10, 15A75, 16W50, 12E20.

Keywords: Identities, Grassmann Algebra, Graded rings and modules, Finite Fields.

To my family.

1. Introduction

In mathematics, the exterior product, or wedge product, of vectors is an algebraic construction used in Euclidean geometry to study areas and volumes. In linear algebra, the exterior product provides an abstract algebraic manner for describing the determinant and minors of a matrix. The exterior algebra, or Grassmann algebra is the algebraic system whose product is the exterior product. Mathematically speaking, the Grassmann algebra is the largest algebra that supports an alternating product on vectors.

The Grassmann algebra is also important for PI-Theory. A celebrated result obtained by Kemer, depicted in (1987, [10]), shows that any associative PI-algebra, over a field F of characteristic zero, is PI-equivalent to the Grassmann envelope of a finite- dimensional associative super-algebra.

An important task in PI-Theory is to describe the identities of the Grassmann algebra. In 1970s, Regev and Krakovsky (1973,[11]) described the identities of the Grassmann algebra over a field of characteristic zero. Almost two decades later, Giambruno and Koshlukov (2001,[9]) found a basis for the identities of Grassmann algebra over an infinite field of characteristic $p > 2$. Briefly, when the ground field is infinite and its characteristic is not equal to two, the identities of the Grassmann algebra follow from the triple commutator.

When the ground field is finite, its characteristic is $p > 2$, and its size is q, it is necessary to include one further identity in the basis. In this situation, the identities follow from the triple commutator and the polynomial $x_1^{pq} - x_1^p$. The researchers C. Bekh-Ochir and S. Rankin worked on this problem in (2011, [2]).

There have been many studies on graded identities of the Grassmann algebra in the last 15 years. When the ground field has characteristic zero, Giambruno, Mishchenko and Zaicev (2001,[8]) described the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities (respectively $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded co-dimension) of the Grassmann algebra equipped with its canonical grading. Anisimov (2001, [1]) and Da Silva (2009, [5]) finished the computation of

$\mathbb{Z}_2$-co-dimensions of Grassmann algebra in the case of a basis of V being homogeneous in this grading. Da Silva and Di Vincenzo (2009, [6]) described the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of the Grassmann algebra for any non-trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading such that a basis of V is homogeneous in this grading.

When the ground field is infinite, with positive characteristic, Centrone (2011,[3]) provided a framework, that describes the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of the Grassmann algebra in the situation explored by Da Silva and Di Vincenzo. As an important contribution to this study, Centrone investigated the situation in which it is necessary to include the identity z^p in the basis, given a determined $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading.

In this paper, the ground field is finite. We found a basis for the graded polynomial identities of the Grassmann algebra, for any non-trivial grading, such that a basis of V is homogeneous in this grading.

So far, our case same as that explored by Centrone. The inclusion of the identity $y_1^{pq} - y_1^p$ in the present work.

We are going to use some results of Regev [12] and Ochir- Rankin [2] in the beginning of this print. The work of Centrone [3] and Ochir-Rankin [2] provided the basis for the strategy that will be employed to prove the main theorems. The paper of Siderov and Chiripov [4] motivated the construction of the SS Total Order. The essay of Da Silva and Di Vincenzo [6] was very important in the section titled Case 3 and contributed to the majority of the computational lemmas.

2. Preliminaries

In this paper, F will denote a fixed finite field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. Moreover, all vector spaces and all algebras are going to be considered over F. The Greek letter Lambda will be an element of F.

Definition 2.1. *The algebra A is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded when A can be written as a sum of subspaces $A = A_0 \oplus A_1$ such that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $A_iA_j \subset A_{i+j}$. The decomposition (A_0, A_1) is called a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading on A. We shall call A_0 the even component and A_1 the odd component. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading $(A, 0)$ is called trivial. An element $a \in A$ is called a homogeneous element when $a \in A_0 \cup A_1$ and we denote its $\mathbb{Z}_2$-degree (when $a \neq 0$) as $\alpha(a)$.*

Remark 2.2. *It is well known that A can be graded by $\mathbb{Z}_2$ (in a non-trivial way) if, and only if, A admits an automorphism of order two.*

If $\phi : A \to A$ is an automorphism of order two, then $A_0 = \{2^{-1}(a+\phi(a))|a \in A\}$ and $A_1 = \{2^{-1}(a - \phi(a))|a \in A\}$.

Let $Y = \{y_1, \cdots, y_n, \cdots\}$ and $Z = \{z_1, \cdots, z_n, \cdots\}$ be two countable sets of variables. We denote by $F\langle X\rangle$ the free algebra freely generated by $X = Y \cup Z$. We define the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-degree of 1 by 0. For any variable $y_i \in Y$, we say that $\alpha(y_i) = 0$; similarly for any variable $z_i \in Z$ we say that $\alpha(z_i) = 0$. We define the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-degree of a monomial $m = x_1 \cdots x_n \in F\langle X\rangle$ by $\alpha(m) = \alpha(x_1) + \cdots + \alpha(x_n)$. In this way, $F\langle X\rangle$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded algebra, whereas $F\langle X\rangle_0$ is spanned by the monomials of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-degree 0 and the empty word 1, and $F\langle X\rangle_1$ is spanned by the monomials of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-degree 1.

Let A be a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded algebra. A polynomial $f(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in F\langle X\rangle$ is called a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded polynomial identity for A (or a 2-graded polynomial identity for A) when $f(a_1, \cdots, a_n) = 0$ for all $a_i \in A_{\alpha(x_1)}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. The set of all identities of A is denoted by $T_2(A)$. An endomorphism ϕ of $F\langle X\rangle$ is called a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded

endomorphism when $\phi(F\langle X\rangle_i) \subset F\langle X\rangle_i, i = 0, 1$. An ideal $I \subset A$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded ideal when $I = (I \cap A_0) \oplus (I \cap A_1)$. It is called a T_2-ideal when $\phi(I) \subset I$ for all $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded endomorphisms of $F\langle X\rangle$. It is not hard to see that $T_2(A)$ is a T_2-ideal. Let S be a non-empty subset of $F\langle X\rangle$. We define the T_2-ideal generated by S as the intersection of all T_2-ideals that contain S, and we denote it by $\langle S\rangle$. A polynomial f is said to be a consequence of S when $f \in \langle S\rangle$. We say that $S \subset F\langle X\rangle$ is a basis for the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of A when $T_2(A) = \langle S\rangle$.

Two $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded algebras A and B are called isomorphic (as super-algebras) when there exists a bijective homomorphism $\rho : A \to B$ such that $\rho(A_i) \subset B_i \;\; i = 1, 2$.

Consider $[x_1, x_2] := x_1x_2 - x_2x_1$ the commutator of x_1 and x_2. Inductively, one defines the *left normed higher commutator* by:

$$[x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1}, x_n] := [[x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1}], x_n] \;\; n = 3, 4, \cdots.$$

Subsequently, we shall use the shortened term "commutators" for left normed higher commutators.

Let $B = \{y_1, \cdots, y_n, \cdots, z_1, \cdots, z_n, \cdots, \cdots, [x_1, x_2], [x_1, x_3], \cdots,$
$[x_2, x_3], [x_2, x_4], \cdots, [x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}, x_{j_3}], \cdots, \cdots, [x_{j_1}, \cdots, x_{j_n}], \cdots\}$ be an ordered linear basis for the subspace generated by X and commutators $[x_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_n}], n = 2, 3, \cdots$.

Due to the **Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt Theorem** (Theorem 1.3.2, of [7]) and one of **Witt's theorems** (namely, Theorem 1.3.5, of [7], which states that the Lie subalgebra $L(X)$ of $F\langle X\rangle^{(-)}$, the Lie algebra of $F\langle X\rangle$, which is generated by X, is isomorphic to the free Lie algebra with X as a set of free generators. Moreover, the universal enveloping algebra of $L(X)$ is $F\langle X\rangle$.), we have the following elements form a linear basis for $F\langle X\rangle$ (we will denote this linear basis by $Pr(X)$):

$$x_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots x_{i_{n_1}}^{a_{n_1}} [x_{j_1}, \cdots, x_{j_l}]^{b_1} \cdots [x_{r_1}, \cdots, x_{r_t}]^{b_{n_2}},$$

$a_1, \cdots, a_{n_1}, b_1, \cdots, b_{n_2}$ are non-negative integers, $x_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_{n_1}}, [x_{j_1}, \cdots, x_{j_l}], \cdots,$
$[x_{r_1}, \cdots, x_{r_t}] \in B$, and $x_{i_1} < \cdots < x_{i_{n_1}} < [x_{j_1}, \cdots, x_{j_l}] < \cdots < [x_{r_1}, \cdots, x_{r_t}]$.

3. $\mathbb{Z}_2$-gradings on Grassmann algebra

Let G be the (unitary) infinite dimensional Grassmann algebra generated by a vector space V with basis $\{e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_n, \cdots\}$.

Note that the set $\mathcal{B} = \{e_{i_1} . \cdots . e_{i_n} | n \geq 0, i_1 < \cdots < i_n\}$ forms a linear basis for G.

We denote by 1_G the unity of G. The subalgebra of G with linear basis $\mathcal{B} - 1_G$ is the infinite dimensional non-unitary Grassmann algebra over F, and is denoted by G^*.

Definition 3.1. *For $a = e_{i_1} \cdots e_{i_n} \in \mathcal{B} - \{1_G\}$, let $supp(a) = \{e_{i_1}, \cdots, e_{i_n}\}$ (support of a) and $wt(a) := |supp(a)|$, while $supp(1_G) = \emptyset$ and $wt(1_G) = 0$. Now, for any $g = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i a_i \in G - \{0\}$ (where $a_i \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\lambda_i \in F - \{0\}$). Let $supp(g) := \cup_{i=1}^{n} supp(a_i)$ (support of g) and $wt(g) := max\{wt(a_i) | i = 1, \cdots, n\}$ (support-length of g) and $dom(g) := \sum_{wt(a_i)=wt(g)} \lambda_i a_i$ (dominant part of g), while we define $supp(0) = \emptyset$ and $|supp(0)| = 0$.*

Consider the following automorphisms of order 2 on G:

$$\begin{cases} \phi_0 : G \to G \\ e_i \mapsto -e_i, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n, \cdots \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \phi_\infty : G \to G \\ e_i \mapsto e_i, \text{ if } i \text{ is even} \\ e_i \mapsto -e_i, \text{ if } i \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{k^*} : G \to G \\ e_i \mapsto -e_i, i = 1, \cdots, k \\ e_i \mapsto e_i, i = k+1, \cdots, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \phi_k : G \to G \\ e_i \mapsto e_i, i = 1, \cdots, k \\ e_i \mapsto -e_i, i = k+1, \cdots, \end{cases}$$

Each one of those four automorphisms induces a non-trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading on G.

- : Induced by ϕ_0: G_{can} (or G_0). In this grading, $V \subset (G_{can})_1$;
- : Induced by ϕ_∞: G_∞. In this grading, $\{e_2, \cdots, e_{2n}, \cdots\} \subset (G_\infty)_0$ and $\{e_1, e_3, \cdots, e_{2n+1}, \cdots\} \subset (G_\infty)_1$;
- : Induced by ϕ_{k^*}: G_{k^*}. In this grading, $\{e_1, \cdots, e_k\} \subset (G_{k^*})_1$ and $\{e_{k+1}, e_{k+2}, \cdots, \} \subset (G_{k^*})_0$;
- : Induced by ϕ_k: G_k. In this grading, $\{e_1, \cdots, e_k\} \subset (G_k)_0$ and $\{e_{k+1}, e_{k+2}, \cdots, \} \subset (G_k)_1$.

From now on, G is going to be owned with a grading induced by one of the four automorphisms reported above.

4. $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities for the Grassmann algebra

In this section, we are going to show some graded identities for G.

It is well-known that $[x_1, x_2, x_3] \in T_2(G)$. Another well-known fact is:

Lemma 4.1. $[x_1^p, x_2], [x_1, x_2][x_2, x_3] \in \langle [x_1, x_2, x_3] \rangle$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. Then $z_1^p \in T_2(G)$. Moreover, if $\lambda.1_G + a \in G$ ($a \in G \cap G^*, \lambda \in F$), then $a^p = \lambda^p.1_G$.*

Proof. These results are respectively consequences of Lemma 1.2-b and Corollary 1.5-a by [12]. □

Corollary 4.3. *In the notation of Lemma 4.2, we have $y_1^{pq} - y_1^p \in T_2(G)$.*

Definition 4.4. *Let $f = \sum_{j=1}^{l} \lambda_j m_j \in F\langle y_1, \cdots, y_n \rangle$ be a linear combination of elements from $Pr(X)$, where $\psi(m_1) = \cdots = \psi(m_l) = 1$. That polynomial is called a p-polynomial when $Deg_{y_i} m_j \equiv 0$ mod p and $Deg_{y_i} m_j < qp$, for all $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$.*

Proposition 4.5. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. Let $f(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ be a p-polynomial. If $f \in T_2(G)$ is a p-polynomial, then f is the zero polynomial.*

Proof. It is enough to repeat word for word Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.1 by [2]. □

Corollary 4.6. *In the notation of Proposition 4.5, if $f(y_1, \cdots, y_m)$ is a non-zero p-polynomial, then there exist $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m \in F$ such that $f(\alpha_1.1_G, \cdots, \alpha_m.1_G) \neq 0$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 4.5, $f(y_1, \cdots, y_m) \notin T_2(G)$.

On the other hand, if $\lambda.1_G + a \in G$ ($a \in G \cap G^*$), then $a^p = \lambda^p.1_G$. So, there exist $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m \in F$ such that $f(\alpha_1.1_G, \cdots, \alpha_m.1_G) \neq 0$ and we are done. □

5. SS and SS Total Order

Let $u = z_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots z_{i_{n_1}}^{a_{n_1}} [x_{j_1}, \cdots, x_{j_l}]^{c_1} \cdots [x_{r_1}, \cdots, x_{r_t}]^{c_{n_2}}$ be an element of $Pr(X)$. For modulo $\langle [x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1^p \rangle$, u can be written as:

$$(\prod_{r=1}^{n_1} z_{i_r}^{b_{i_r}})[x_{t_1}, x_{t_2}] \cdots [x_{t_{2l-1}}, x_{t_{2l}}],$$

where $0 \leq b_{i_1}, \cdots, b_{i_m} < p-1$; $x_{t_1} < \cdots < x_{t_{2l}}$; $\lambda \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

Definition 5.1. *Let $a = (\prod_{r=1}^{n} y_{j_r}^{a_{j_r}})(\prod_{r=1}^{m} z_{i_r}^{b_{i_r}})[x_{t_1}, x_{t_2}] \cdots [x_{t_{2l-1}}, x_{t_{2l}}] \in Pr(X)$. We say that $a \in SS$ when $0 \leq a_{j_1}, \cdots, a_{j_n}, b_{i_1}, \cdots, b_{i_m} \leq p-1$, and $\psi(a)$ is multilinear or $\psi(a) = 1$.*

Definition 5.2. *Let $a = (\prod_{r=1}^{n} y_{j_r}^{a_{j_r}})(\prod_{r=1}^{m} z_{i_r}^{b_{i_r}})[x_{t_1}, x_{t_2}] \cdots [x_{t_{2l-1}}, x_{t_{2l}}] \in SS$. We define:*

- **:** *$beg(a) := (\prod_{r=1}^{n} y_{j_r}^{a_{j_r}})(\prod_{r=1}^{m} z_{i_r}^{b_{i_r}})$ and $\psi(a) := x_{t_1} \cdots x_{t_{2l}}$;*
- **:** *$\Pi(Y)(a) := (\prod_{r=1}^{n} y_{j_r}^{a_{j_r}})$ and $\Pi(Z)(a) := (\prod_{r=1}^{m} z_{i_r}^{b_{i_r}})$;*
- **:** *$pr(z)(a) = z_{i_1}$, $\Pi_1(Z)(a) := (z_{i_1}^{b_{i_1}-1} \prod_{r=2}^{m} z_{i_r}^{b_{i_r}})$ (if $b_{i_1} \geq 1$);*
- **:** *$Deg_{x_i} a$: the number of times that the variable x_i appears in $beg(a)\psi(a)$;*
- **:** *$deg_Y a := \sum_{y \in Y} Deg_y(a)$, $deg_Z a := \sum_{z \in Z} Deg_z(a)$ and $dega := deg_Z a + deg_Y a$.*

Definition 5.3. *Let $u, v \in SS$ such that $\psi(u) = \psi(v) = 1$. We say that $u <_{lex-rig} v$ when $Deg_{x_1} u < Deg_{x_1} v$ for some $x_1 \in X$. Moreover, $Deg_x u = Deg_x v$ for every $x > x_1$ (with respect to ordered basis of $L(X)$).*

Definition 5.4 (**SS Total Order**). *Given two elements $u, v \in SS$, we say that $u < v$ when:*

- **:** *$degu < degv$ or;*
- **:** *$degu = degv$, but $beg(u) <_{lex-rig} beg(v)$ or;*
- **:** *$degu = degv, beg(u) = beg(v)$, but $\psi(u) <_{lex-rig} \psi(v)$.*

Remark 5.5. *Notice that if $u \in SS - \{1\}$, then $1 < u$.*

6. Test polynomials

The next proposition is immediate consequence of Lemmas 4.1, 4.2, and Corollary 4.3.

Proposition 6.1. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. Let $f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i v_i$ be a linear combination from $Pr(X)$.*

For modulo $\langle [x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1^p, y_1^{pq} - y_1^p \rangle$, f can be written as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} f_i u_i,$$

where $f_1, \cdots, f_m$ are p-polynomials and $u_1, \cdots, u_m \in SS$ is (are) distinct.

Definition 6.2. *A test polynomial is an expression of the form:*

$$f = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i u_i,$$

where f_0 is a p-polynomial and $f_1, \cdots, f_n$ are non-zero p-polynomials. Moreover $u_1, \cdots, u_n \in SS - \{1\}$ is (are) distinct. The Leading Term of f ($LT(f)$) is the greatest element of $\{u_1, \cdots, u_n\}$.

Definition 6.3. *Let $f = f_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} f_j u_j$ be a test polynomial, where $n \geq 2$ and $deg_Z beg(LT(f)) > 0$. An element $u_i \in \{u_1, \cdots, u_n\}$ is called a bad term of f when the following assertions hold true:*

(1) $Deg_x(u_i) = Deg_x(LT(f))$ *for all* $x \in X$, *i.e,* u_i *and* $LT(f)$ *have the same multi-degree;*
(2) *If* $z \neq pr(z)(LT(f))$, *then* $Deg_z beg(LT(f)) = Deg_z beg(u_i)$;
(3) *If* $z = pr(z)(LT(f))$, *then* $Deg_z beg(u_i) + 1 = Deg_z beg(LT(f))$;
(4) *If* $x \in Y$, *then* $Deg_x beg(LT(f)) \leq Deg_x beg(u_i)$.

We denote by $LBT(f)$ *the greatest bad term of* f *(leading bad term of* f*).*

Lemma 6.4. *In the notation of Definition 6.3, if* u_i *is a bad term of* f, *we have:*

(1) $\Pi_1(Z)(LT(f)) = \Pi(Z)(u_i)$;
(2) *If* $z_1 = pr(z)(LT(f))$, *then* $Deg_{z_1}(\psi(u_i)) = 1$;
(3) *There exists a variable* $x \in Y$ *such that* $Deg_x beg(LT(f)) < Deg_x beg(u_i)$;
(4) $deg_Z(beg(u_i)) + deg_Y(\psi(u_i)) < deg_Z(beg(LT(f))) + deg_Y(\psi(LT(f)))$;
(5) $\Pi(Y)(LT(f)) <_{lex-rig} \Pi(Y)(LBT(f))$.

Proof. Statements 1 and 2 are immediate consequences of the definition of bad term.

Statement 3: suppose on the contrary that $Deg_y beg(LT(f)) = Deg_y beg(u_i)$ for all $y \in Y$. So $deg_Y \psi(u_i) = deg_Y \psi(LT(f))$. Moreover, notice that $deg_Z \psi(u_i) = deg_Z \psi(LT(f)) + 1$. However, $deg(\psi(LT(f))) - deg(\psi(u_i))$ is an even integer. This fact proves the statement 4.

Statements 4 and 5 are immediate consequences of statement 3 and the definition of bad term. □

Definition 6.5. *Let* $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ *be a test polynomial and* $u_i \in \{u_1, \cdots, u_n\}$. *A* T_{u_i}*-sequence is an* m*-tuple,* $(a_1, \cdots, a_j, \cdots, a_m) \in G^m$, *whose elements* a_j *satisfy:*

: *1) If* $Deg_{x_j} u_i = 0$, $a_j = 0$.
: *2) If* $Deg_{x_j} u_i > 0$, a_j *is a sum of homogeneous elements (each homogeneous element has coefficient* 1*) of* $\mathbb{Z}_2$*-degree* $\alpha(x_j)$. *Moreover:*
  2.1) The number of summands of a_j *is* $Deg_{x_j} u_i$.
  2.2) If a_{j1} *and* a_{j2} *are summands of* a_j, $supp(a_{j1}) \cap supp(a_{j2}) = \emptyset$.
  2.3) If $Deg_{x_j}(\psi(u_i)) = 0$, *the summand (summands) of* a_j *has (have) support-length* 2.
  2.4) If $Deg_{x_j}(\psi(u_i)) = 1$ *and* $Deg_{x_j} u_i \geq 2$, *only one summand of* a_j *has support-length equal to* 1, *but the other summand (summands) of* a_j *has (have) support-length* 2.
  2.5) If $Deg_{x_j}(\psi(u_i)) = 1$ *and* $Deg_{x_j} u_i = 1$, a_j *has support-length* 1.

Furthermore, if $r \neq l$, $supp(a_r) \cap supp(a_l) = \{\}$.

Definition 6.6. *Let* $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ *be a test polynomial, where* $deg_Z(beg(u_i)) > 0$ *for some* $u_i \in \{u_1, \cdots, u_n\}$. *An Almost Type-*$u_i$ *sequence is an* m*-tuple,* $AT_{u_i} = (a_1, \cdots, a_j, \cdots, a_m) \in G^m$ *that is defined like a Type-*u_i *sequence, with the exception of property 2.3. Instead, the following properties hold:*

: *I) If* $x_j \neq pr(z)(u_i)$ *and* $Deg_{x_j}(\psi(u_i)) = 0$, *the summand (summands) of* a_j *has (have) support-length* 2;
: *II) If* $x_j = pr(z)(u_i)$, $Deg_{x_j}(\psi(u_i)) = 0$ *and* $Deg_{x_j}(u_i) \geq 2$, *only one summand of* a_j *has support-length* 1, *but the other has (have) support-length* 2;
: *III) If* $x_j = pr(z)(u_i)$, $Deg_{x_j}(\psi(u_i)) = 0$ *and* $Deg_{x_j}(u_i) = 1$, *then* a_j *has support-length* 1.

In the notation of Definition 6.5 (respectively Definition 6.6), we say that an element $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is complete with respect to T_{u_i} (respectively AT_{u_i}) when:

$$supp(g) = (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} supp(a_i)).$$

Definition 6.7. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ be a test polynomial. A Scalar-f sequence is an m-tuple $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G) \in (F.1_G)^m$, where $\lambda_i = 0$ if $x_i \in Z$.*

The next two lemmas may readily be seen from an adaptation of the Binomial Theorem.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $u_1 = x_1^m$ be a test polynomial. If $(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i)$ is a Type-u sequence and $(\lambda_1.1_G)$ is a Scalar-u sequence, then:*

- : $dom \;\; u(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i) = m!a_1.\cdots.a_m$;
- : $dom \;\; u(\lambda_1.1_G + \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i) = m!a_1.\cdots.a_m$

Lemma 6.9. *Let $u = z_1^m$ be a test polynomial. If $(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i)$ is an Almost Type-u sequence, then:*

- : $dom \;\; u(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i) = m!a_1.\cdots.a_m$.

Lemma 6.10. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ be a test polynomial. Consider $u_i \in \{u_1, \cdots, u_n\}$. If a Type-$u_i$ sequence $T_{u_i} = (A_1, \cdots, A_m)$ exists, then:*

- : $dom(u_i(A_1, \ldots, A_m)) = \lambda.g$, *where $\lambda \in F - \{0\}$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is complete with respect to T_{u_i};*
- : *If $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G) \in G^m$ is a Scalar-f sequence, then* $dom(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) = dom(u_i(A_1, \cdots, A_m))$.

Proof. First of all, put $A_j = \sum_{k=1}^{Deg_{x_j} u_i} a_{j,k}$.

According to assumption, there exists a Type-u_i sequence T_{u_i}. Therefore, by Lemma 6.8:

$$dom(u_i(A_1, \cdots, A_m)) = dom(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m) = \pm 2^l (\prod_{r=1}^{m} n_r!)(\prod_{(j,k(j)) \in \mathcal{X}} a_{jk(j)}),$$

where

- : $2l = deg(\psi(u_i))$;
- : $n_r = Deg_{x_r} beg(LT(f))$;
- : $\mathcal{X}(j) := \{(j, k(j)) | k(j) = 1, \cdots, Deg_{x_j} u_i\}$, and $\mathcal{X} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} \mathcal{X}(j)$.

□

Following word for word the proof of Lemma 6.10, it is possible to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.11. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ be a test polynomial, where $deg_Z beg(u_i) \geq 1$ for some $u_i \in \{u_1, \cdots, u_n\}$. If there exists an Almost Type-u_i sequence $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$, then:*

- : $dom(u_i(A_1, \ldots, A_m)) = \lambda.g$, *where $\lambda \in F - \{0\}$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is complete with respect to AT_{u_i};*
- : *If $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G) \in G^m$ is a Scalar-f sequence, then* $dom(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) = dom(u_i(A_1, \cdots, A_m))$.

7. Leading terms

In this section, we prove the important results that are going to be used in the next three sections.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} u_t$ be a test polynomial and let $(\lambda_1 1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m 1_G)$ be a Scalar-f sequence. If there exists a Type-$LT(f)$ sequence $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$, then:*

: $dom(f(\lambda_1 1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m 1_G + A_m)) = dom(LT(f)(A_1, \cdots, A_m))$.

Moreover, if $n > 1$ and $u_i < LT(f)$:

$$wt(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) < wt(LT(f)(A_1, \cdots, A_m)).$$

Proof. If $n = 1$, the proof is an immediate consequence of Lemma 6.10. Suppose that $n > 1$ and consider $u_i < LT(f)$. It is enough to prove that no summand of $dom(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m))$ is complete with respect to $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$.

: Case 1: $degu_i < degLT(f)$. In this situation, a variable x_j that appears more times in $LT(f)$ than u_i exists. According to assumption, $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$ is a Type-$LT(f)$ sequence. So, if $Deg_{x_j}beg(LT(f)) > Deg_{x_j}beg(u_i)$, then the summand (summands) of $u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)$ has (have), at most, $|supp(A_j)| - 2$ elements of $supp(A_j)$. If $Deg_{x_j}(beg(LT(f))) = Deg_{x_j}(beg(u_i))$, then the summand (summands) of $u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)$ has (have), at most, $|supp(A_j)| - 1$ elements of $supp(A_j)$.

: Case 2: $degu_i = degLT(f)$ and $beg(u_i) <_{lex-rig} beg(LT(f))$. In this situation, there exists a variable x_j that appears more times in $beg(LT(f))$ than $beg(u_i)$. Consequently, the summand (summands) of $u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)$ has (have), at most, $|supp(A_j)| - 2$ elements of $supp(A_j)$.

: Case 3: $degu_i = degLT(f)$, $beg(LT(f)) = beg(u_i)$, but $\psi(u_i) <_{lex-rig} \psi(LT(f))$. In this case, there exists a variable x_j that appears in $\psi(LT(f))$ but does not appear in $\psi(u_i)$. Consequently, the summand (summands) of $u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)$ has (have), at most, $|supp(A_j)| - 1$ elements of $supp(A_j)$. We are done.

□

Lemma 7.2. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} u_t$ be a test polynomial ($deg_Z beg(LT(f)) > 0$), and $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G)$ a Scalar-f sequence. If f does not admit a bad term and there exists an Almost Type-$LT(f)$ sequence $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$, then:*

: $dom(f(\lambda_1 1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m 1_G + A_m)) = dom(LT(f)(A_1, \cdots, A_m))$.

Moreover, if $n > 1$ and $u_i < LT(f)$, then:

$$wt(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) < wt(LT(f)(A_1, \cdots, A_m)).$$

Proof. If $n = 1$, the proof is obvious.

Notice that $Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}\psi(LT(f)) = 0$. Suppose that $n > 1$ and consider $u_i < LT(f)$. It is enough to prove that no summand $dom(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m))$ is complete with respect to $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$.

: Case 1: $deg(u_i) < deg(LT(f))$. This is similar to Case 1 of Lemma 7.1.

: Case 2: $deg(u_i) = deg(LT(f))$, but $beg(u_i) <_{lex-rig} beg(LT(f))$.

Subcase 2.1: There exists $x_j \in X - \{pr(z)(LT(f))\}$ such that $Deg_{x_j}beg(u_i) < Deg_{x_j}beg(LT(f))$. In this situation, it is not

hard to see that no summand of $u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)$ contains more than $|supp(A_j)| - 2$ elements of $supp(A_j)$.

Subcase 2.2: $Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(u_i) < Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}LT(f)$ and $Deg_x beg(LT(f)) \leq Deg_x beg(u_i)$ for all $x \in X - \{pr(z)(LT(f))\}$.

Notice that if $Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(LT(f)) - Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(u_i) = 1$, u_i and $LT(f)$ have the same multi-degree, then there is $x \in Y$ such that $Deg_x beg(u_i) < Deg_x beg(LT(f))$, because u_i is not a bad term. Moreover, if $Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(LT(f)) - Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(u_i) = 1$, u_i and $LT(f)$ do not have the same multi-degree ($Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}\psi(u_i) = 1$), there must exist $x_i \in X - \{pr(z)(LT(f))\}$ such that $Deg_{x_i}u_i < Deg_{x_i}LT(f)$. The remaining part of the proof is similar to Case 1 of Lemma 7.1.

Subcase 2.2.1: $Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(LT(f)) - Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(u_i) > 1$. The analysis and the conclusion of this subcase are similar to Subcase 2.1.

Subcase 2.2.2: $Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(LT(f)) - Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}beg(u_i) = 1$, u_i and $LT(f)$ do not have the same multi-degree. If $Deg_{pr(z)(LT(f))}\psi(u_i) = 0$, the analysis is similar to Case 2 of Lemma 7.1.

: Case 3: $degu_i = degLT(f)$, $beg(u_i) = beg(LT(f))$, but $\psi(u_i) <_{lex-rig} \psi(LT(f))$. This is similar to Case 3 of Lemma 7.1.

□

Lemma 7.3. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} u_t$ be a test polynomial ($deg_Z beg(LT(f)) > 0$), and let $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G)$ be a Scalar-f sequence. If f admits a bad term and there exists a Type-$LBT(f)$ sequence $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$, then:*

: $dom(f(\lambda_1 1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m 1_G + A_m)) = dom(LBT(f)(A_1, \cdots, A_m))$.

Moreover, if $u_i \neq LBT(f)$:

$$wt(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) < wt(LBT(f)(A_1, \cdots, A_m)).$$

Proof. It is enough to prove that if $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$ is a Type-$LBT(f)$ sequence and $u_i \neq LBT(f)$, then no summand of $dom(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m))$ is complete with respect to $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$.

: Case 1: $u_i < LBT(f)$. It is enough to repeat word for word the proof of Lemma 7.1.

: Case 2: $LBT(f) < u_i \leq LT(f)$, but u_i and $LBT(f)$ do not have the same multi-degree. First, notice that $deg(LBT(f)) = deg(u_i)$. In this situation, there must exist $x_i \in X$ such that $Deg_{x_i}u_i < Deg_{x_i}LBT(f)$. The remaining part of the proof is similar to Case 1 of Lemma 7.1.

: Case 3: $LBT(f) < u_i \leq LT(f)$, u_i and $LBT(f)$ have the same multi-degree. By the definition of bad term: $deg(LT(f)) = deg(u_i) = deg(LBT(f))$, and $\Pi_1(Z)(LT(f)) = \Pi(Z)(LBT(f))$. Thus, $\Pi(Z)(LBT(f)) \leq_{lex-rig} \Pi(Z)(u_i) \leq_{lex-rig} \Pi(Z)(LT(f))$.

Subcase 3.1: $\Pi(Z)(u_i) = \Pi(Z)(LT(f))$. In this situation, $\Pi(Y)(u_i) \leq_{lex-rig} \Pi(Y)(LT(f))$, because $beg(u_i) \leq_{lex-rig} beg(LT(f))$. On the other hand, $\Pi(Y)(LT(f)) <_{lex-rig} \Pi(Y)(LBT(f))$. So, there must exist $x_i \in Y$ such that $Deg_{x_i}beg(u_i) < Deg_{x_i}beg(LBT(f))$. The remaining part of the proof is similar to Case 2 of Lemma 7.1.

Subcase 3.2: $\Pi(Z)(u_i) <_{lex-rig} \Pi(Z)(LT(f))$. In this situation, $\Pi(Z)(LBT(f)) = \Pi(Z)(u_i)$. By the definitions of leading term and bad

term, there must exist $x_i \in Y$ such that $Deg_{x_i} beg(u_i) < Deg_{x_i} beg(LBT(f))$. The remaining part of the proof is similar to Case 2 of Lemma 7.1.

□

Proposition 7.4. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ be a test polynomial. If there exists a Type-$LT(f)$ sequence $T_{LT(f)} = (A_1, \cdots, A_m)$, then there is a Scalar-f sequence $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G)$ such that:*

$$dom(f(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) = \lambda.g,$$

where $\lambda \in F - \{0\}$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is complete with respect to $T_{LT(f)}$.

Proof. Suppose without loss of generality that $LT(f) = u_1$. According to Corollary 4.6, there exists a Scalar-u_1 sequence $(\lambda_1 1_G, \cdots, \lambda_n.1_G)$ such that $f_1(\lambda_1 1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m 1_G) = \alpha.1_G \neq 0$.

Consider the polynomial $g = \sum_{t=1}^{n} u_t$. According to assumption, there exists a Type-u_1 sequence $(A_1, \cdots, A_m)$. Therefore, by Lemmas 6.10 and 7.1: $dom(g(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) = dom(u_1(A_1, \cdots, A_m)) = \lambda.g \neq 0$, where $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is complete with respect to T_{u_1}. Moreover, if $n \geq 2$ and $u_i < u_1$:

$$wt(u_i(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) < wt(u_1(A_1, \cdots, A_m)).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 6.10,$dom(u_1(A_1, \cdots, A_m)) = dom(u_1(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m))$ and consequently:

$$dom(f(\lambda_1 1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) = f_1(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G).dom(u_1(A_1, \cdots, A_m)) = \alpha.\lambda.g.$$

□

Proposition 7.5. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ be a test polynomial ($deg_Z beg(LT(f)) > 0$). If f does not admit a bad term and there exists an Almost Type-$LT(f)$ sequence $AT_{LT(f)} = (A_1, \cdots, A_m)$, then there is a Scalar-f sequence $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G)$ such that:*

$$dom(f(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) = \lambda.g,$$

where $\lambda \in F - \{0\}$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is complete with respect to $AT_{LT(f)}$.

Proof. It is enough to repeat word for word the proof of Proposition 7.4, with two exceptions: instead of Lemma 6.10, we will apply Lemma 6.11; instead of Lemma 7.1, we will apply Lemma 7.2. □

Proposition 7.6. *Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = f_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{n} f_t u_t$ be a test polynomial ($deg_Z(beg(LT(f))) > 0$). If f admits a bad term and there exists a Type-$LBT(f)$ sequence $T_{LBT(f)} = (A_1, \cdots, A_m)$, then there is a Scalar-f sequence $(\lambda_1.1_G, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G)$ such that:*

$$dom(f(\lambda_1.1_G + A_1, \cdots, \lambda_m.1_G + A_m)) = \lambda.g,$$

where $\lambda \in F - \{0\}$ and $g \in \mathcal{B}$ is complete with respect to $T_{LBT(f)}$.

Proof. It is enough to repeat word for word the proof of Proposition 7.4, with two exceptions: instead of Lemma 7.1, we will apply Lemma 7.3; we assume that $LBT(f) = u_1$. □

8. Case 1: G_{can} and G_∞

In this section, we describe the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of G_{can} and G_∞.

It is well known that $[y_1, y_2], [y_1, z_2], z_1z_2 + z_2z_1 \in T_2(G_{can})$. Moreover, due to the graded identity $z_1z_2 + z_2z_1$, we have $z_1^k \in T_2(G_{can})$ for $k > 1$.

Theorem 8.1. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of G (with grading induced by ϕ_0) follow from:*

$$[y_1, y_2], [y_1, z_2], z_1z_2 + z_2z_1 \text{ and } y_1^{pq} - y_1^p.$$

Proof. Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by $[y_1, y_2], [y_1, z_2], z_1z_2 + z_2z_1$ and $y_1^{pq} - y_1^p$. Suppose by contradiction that $I \subsetneq T_2(G_{can})$. Thus, there would exist a polynomial $f = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i v_i \in T_2(G_{can}) - I$, where $v_1, \cdots, v_n \in Pr(X)$ is (are) distinct. Note that f is not a p-polynomial. We may suppose that f is a test polynomial of the form:

$$\begin{gathered} f = f_0 + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^l f_i y_1^{A_{i,1}} \cdots y_m^{A_{i,m}} [z_1, z_2] \cdots [z_{n-1}, z_n] \text{ if } n \text{ is even or} \\ f = f_0 + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^l f_i y_1^{A_{i,1}} \cdots y_m^{A_{i,m}} z_1 \text{ or} \\ f = f_0 + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^l f_i y_1^{A_{i,1}} \cdots y_m^{A_{i,m}} z_1 [z_2, z_3] \cdots [z_{n-1}, z_n] \text{ if } n > 1 \text{ is odd.} \end{gathered}$$

Without loss of generality, we suppose that $LT(f) = y_1^{A_{1,1}} \cdots y_m^{A_{1,m}}; A_{1,1}, \cdots, A_{1,m} > 0$ and $f = f(y_1, \cdots, y_m, z_1, \cdots, z_n)$. Notice that f does not admit a bad term.

We prove the theorem by the following cases.

- : For even n. In this situation, $(e_1e_2 + \cdots + e_{2(b_1)-1}e_{2(b_1)}, \cdots, e_{2(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} b_j)+1}e_{2(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} b_j+1)} + \cdots + e_{2(\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_j)-1}e_{2(\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_j)}, e_{M+1}, \cdots, e_{M+n})$, where $b_j = A_{1,j}$ and $M = 2(b_1 + \cdots + b_m)$, is a Type-$LT(f)$. On the other hand, by Proposition 7.4, we have $f \notin T_2(G_{can})$, which is a contradiction.
- : For odd n. In this situation, the sequence above is an Almost Type-$LT(f)$ sequence. On the other hand, by Proposition 7.5, we have $f \notin T_2(G_{can})$, which is a contradiction.

□

Now, we describe the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of G_∞.

Theorem 8.2. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. Then the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of G (with grading induced by ϕ_∞) follow from:*

$$[x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1^p \text{ and } y_1^{pq} - y_1^p.$$

Proof. Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by the three identities above. Suppose by contradiction that $I \subsetneq T_2(G_\infty)$. According to Proposition 6.1, there exists a test polynomial $f = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n f_i u_i \in T_2(G_\infty) - I$.

We may suppose without loss of generality that:

$$\begin{gathered} LT(f) = y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_{n_1}^{a_{n_1}} y_{n_1+1}^{a_{n_1+1}} \cdots y_{n_2}^{a_{n_2}} z_1^{b_1} \cdots z_{m_1}^{b_{m_1}} z_{m_1+1}^{b_{m_1+1}} \cdots z_{m_2}^{b_{m_2}} \\ [y_{n_1+1}, y_{n_1+2}] \cdots [y_{n_2}, y_{n_2+1}] \cdots [y_{l_1}, z_{m_1+1}] \cdots [z_{m_2-1}, z_{m_2}] \cdots [z_{l_2-1}, z_{l_2}], \end{gathered}$$

where $n_1 < n_2 < l_1, m_1 < m_2 < l_2$; $a_1, \cdots, a_{n_2}, b_1, \cdots, b_{m_2} > 0$.

Suppose that $f = f(y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2})$. Consider the following map:

$$\phi : \{y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2}\} \to G$$

$$\begin{gathered}
y_1 \mapsto \sum_{l=1}^{a_1} e_{4l-2}e_{4l} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n_1} \mapsto \sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1-1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1}} e_{4l-2}e_{4l} \\
y_{n_1+1} \mapsto e_{4(\sum_{l=1}^{n_1} a_l)+2} + \sum_{l=1}^{a_{n_1+1}} e_{4(\sum_{l=1}^{n_1} a_l)+4l}e_{4(\sum_{l=1}^{n_1} a_l)+4l+2} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n_2} \mapsto e_{4(\sum_{i=1}^{n_2-1} a_i)+2(n_2-n_1)} + \\
+ \sum_{l=1}^{a_{n_2}} e_{4(\sum_{i=1}^{n_2-1} a_i)+2(n_2-n_1)+4l-2}e_{4(\sum_{i=1}^{n_2-1} a_i)+2(n_2-n_1)+4l} \\
y_{n_2+1} \mapsto e_{4(\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} a_i)+2(n_2-n_1+1)} \\
\cdots \\
y_{l_1} \mapsto e_{4(\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} a_i)+2(l_1-n_1)} \\
z_1 \mapsto \sum_{l=1}^{b_1} e_{2l-1}e_{M+2l} \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_1} \mapsto \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1-1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}} e_{2l-1}e_{M+2l} \\
z_{m_1+1} \mapsto e_{2(\sum_{l=1}^{m_1} b_l)+1} + \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1+1}} e_{2l+1}e_{M+2l} \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_2} \mapsto e_{2(\sum_{l=1}^{m_2-1} b_l)+2(m_2-m_1)-1} + \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}} e_{2(l+m_2-m_1)-1}e_{M+2l} \\
z_{m_2+1} \mapsto e_{2(\sum_{l=1}^{m_2} b_l+m_2-m_1)+1} \\
\cdots \\
z_{l_2} \mapsto e_{2(\sum_{l=1}^{m_2} b_l)+2(l_2-m_1)-1},
\end{gathered}$$

where $M = 4(\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} a_i) + 2(l_1 - n_1)$.

Notice that $(\phi(y_1), \cdots, \phi(y_{l_1}), \phi(z_1), \cdots, \phi(z_{l_2}))$ is a Type-$LT(f)$ sequence.

On the other hand, by Proposition 7.4, $f \notin T_2(G_\infty)$ that is a contradiction. □

9. Case 2: G_{k^*}

In this section, we describe the identities of G_{k^*}.

It is easy to see that $z_1 \cdots z_{k+1} \in T_2(G_{k^*})$ (see for instance, Lemma 4.2 of [3]). Moreover z_1^p is consequence of $z_1 \cdots z_{k+1}$ when $k < p$.

Definition 9.1. *An element $a \in SS$ is labeled as Type-1 (or $u \in SS1$) when:*

: *$deg_Z(a) \leq k$.*

Due to identity $z_1 \cdots z_{k+1} \in T_2(G_{k^*})$, we have a version of Proposition 6.1 for G_{k^*}:

Proposition 9.2. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. Let $f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i v_i$ be a linear combination from $Pr(X)$. For modulo $\langle [x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1^p, y_1^{pq} - y_1^p, z_1 \cdots z_{k+1} \rangle$, f can be written as:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} f_i u_i,$$

where $f_1, \cdots, f_m$ are p-polynomials and $u_1, \cdots, u_m \in SS1$ is (are) distinct.

Theorem 9.3. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of G (with grading induced by ϕ_{k^*}) follow from:*

$$[x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1 \cdots z_{k+1}, z_1^p \text{ and } y_1^{pq} - y_1^p.$$

Proof. Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by the four identities above. Suppose by contradiction that $I \subsetneq T_2(G_{k^*})$. According to Proposition 9.2, there exists a test polynomial $f = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i u_i \in T_2(G_{k^*}) - I$, where $u_1, \cdots, u_n \in SS1 - \{1\}$.

We may suppose without loss of generality that:

$$LT(f) = y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_{n_1}^{a_{n_1}} y_{n_1+1}^{a_{n_1+1}} \cdots y_{n_2}^{a_{n_2}} z_1^{b_1} \cdots z_{m_1}^{b_{m_1}} z_{m_1+1}^{b_{m_1+1}} \cdots z_{m_2}^{b_{m_2}}$$
$$[y_{n_1+1}, y_{n_1+2}] \cdots [y_{n_2}, y_{n_2+1}] \cdots [y_{l_1}, z_{m_1+1}] \cdots [z_{m_2-1}, z_{m_2}] \cdots [z_{l_2-1}, z_{l_2}],$$

where $n_1 < n_2 < l_1, m_1 < m_2 < l_2; a_1, \cdots, a_{n_2}, b_1, \cdots, b_{m_2} > 0$.

Suppose that $f = f(y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2})$. Consider the following map:

$$\begin{gathered}
\phi : \{y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2}\} \to G \\
y_1 \mapsto \sum_{l=1}^{a_1} e_{k+2l-1} e_{k+2l} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n_1} \mapsto \sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1-1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1}} e_{k+2l-1} e_{k+2l} \\
y_{n_1+1} \mapsto e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1})+1} + \sum_{l=1}^{a_{n_1+1}} e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1})+2l} e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1})+2l+1} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n_2} \mapsto e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2-1})+(n_2-n_1)} + \\
\sum_{l=1}^{a_{n_2}} e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2-1})+(n_2-n_1)+2l-1} e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2-1})+(n_2-n_1)+2l} \\
y_{n_2+1} \mapsto e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2-1}+a_{n_2})+(n_2-n_1)+1} \\
\cdots \\
y_{l_1} \mapsto e_{k+2(a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2-1}+a_{n_2})+(l_1-n_1)} \\
z_1 \mapsto \sum_{l=1}^{b_1} e_l e_{Q+l} \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_1} \mapsto \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1-1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}} e_l e_{Q+l} \\
z_{m_1+1} \mapsto e_{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}+1} + \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1+1}} e_{l+1} e_{Q+l} \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_2} \mapsto e_{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+(m_2-m_1)} + \sum_{l=1}^{b_{m_2}} e_{l+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+(m_2-m_1)} e_{Q+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+l} \\
z_{m_2+1} \mapsto e_{T+1} \\
\cdots \\
z_{l_2} \mapsto e_{T+l_2-m_2},
\end{gathered}$$

where $Q = k + 2(a_1 + \cdots + a_{n_2-1} + a_{n_2}) + (l_1 - n_1)$ and $T = b_1 + \cdots + b_{m_2-1} + b_{m_2} + (m_2 - m_1)$.

Notice that $(\phi(y_1), \cdots, \phi(y_{l_1}), \phi(z_1), \cdots, \phi(z_{l_2}))$ is a Type-$LT(f)$ sequence.

On the other hand, by Proposition 7.4, $f \notin T_2(G_{k^*})$ that is a contradiction. □

10. Case 3: G_k

In this section, we describe the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities for G_k. Unlike papers [3] and [6], we will not use representation theory methodology.

Lemma 10.1. *The following polynomials are graded identities for G_k:*

- *a) $h_1(y_1, \cdots, y_{k+1}) = [y_1, y_2] \cdots [y_k, y_{k+1}]$ (if k is odd) (1);*
- *b) $h_2(y_1, \cdots, y_{k+1}, x) = [y_1, y_2] \cdots [y_{k-1}, y_k][y_{k+1}, x]$ (if k is even; $x \in X - \{y_1, \cdots, y_{k+1}\}$) (2).*

Proof. Suppose without loss of generality that k is an even positive integer. Since h_2 is a multilinear polynomial, it is sufficient to evaluate it for $\mathcal{B}$.

Let $S = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}\} \subset (G_k)_0 \cap \mathcal{B}$ be a multiset and let $S' = \{b_1\} \subset (G_k)_{\alpha(x)} \cap \mathcal{B}$. If S contains an element of even support-length, it is clear that

$H_2(a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}, b_1) = 0$. If every element of S has even support-length, there are $a_i, a_j \in S$ such that $supp(a_i) \cap supp(a_j) \neq \{\}$. So $h_2(a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}, b_1) = 0$ and we are done. □

Let $T' = (i_1, \cdots, i_l)$ and $T = (j_1, \cdots, j_t)$ be two strictly ordered sequences of positive integers such that t is even, $l+t = m$, and $\{1, \cdots, m\} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_l, j_1, \cdots, j_t\}$. Let us next define:

$$f_T(z_1, \cdots, z_m) = z_{i_1} \cdots z_{i_l}[z_{j_1}, z_{j_2}] \cdots [z_{j_{t-1}}, z_{j_t}].$$

In the same way, let $T' = (i_1, \cdots, i_l)$ and $T = (j_1, \cdots, j_t)$ be two strictly ordered sequences of positive integers such that t is odd, $l + t = m$, and $\{1, \cdots, m\} = \{i_1, \cdots, i_l, j_1, \cdots, j_t\}$. Let us then define:

$$r_T(y_1, z_1, \cdots, z_m) = z_{i_1} \cdots z_{i_l}[y_1, z_{j_1}] \cdots [z_{j_{t-1}}, z_{j_t}].$$

Definition 10.2. *Let $m \geq 2$. Let:*

$$g_m(z_1, \cdots, z_m) = \sum_{|T| \text{ is even}} (-2)^{\frac{-|T|}{2}} f_T(z_1, \cdots, z_m).$$

Moreover: $g_1(z) = z$.

Lemma 10.3. *The polynomial $g_{k+2}(z_1, \ldots, z_{k+2})$ is a graded identity for G_k.*

Proof. It is enough to repeat word for word the proof for Proposition 18 by [6]. □

Corollary 10.4. *The multilinear polynomials $[g_{k+1}, y]$ and $g_{k+1}[z_{k+2}, y]$ are graded identities for G_k.*

Proof. First, note that $[z_1, y], z_2[z_1, y] \in T_2(G_0)$.

According to Lemma 10.3, $g_{k+1} \in T_2(G_{k-1})$ when $k \geq 1$.

Let G' be the (unitary) Grassmann algebra generated by $\{e_1, \cdots, \widehat{e_i}, \cdots, e_n, \cdots\}$ ($\widehat{e_i}$ means that $e_i \notin V$).

Notice that $G' = ((G_k)_0 \cap G') \oplus ((G_k)_1 \cap G')$, and $G' \cong G_{k-1}$ (as super-algebras). Thus $g_{k-1} \in T_2(G')$. So by doing basic calculations, we can conclude that $[g_{k+1}, y], g_{k+1}[z_{k+2}, y] \in T_2(G_k)$ as required. □

Corollary 10.5. *If $p > k + 1$, then z^p is a consequence of g_{k+2}.*

Proof. Note that $g_{k+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_1, z_2) = z_1^{k+1} z_2 + (k+1)(-2)^{-1} z_1^k [z_1, z_2]$.

So $g_{k+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_1) = z_1^{k+2}$, and we are done. □

Corollary 10.6. *The following polynomials are graded identities for G_k:*

- $h_3 = g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})[y_1, y_2] \cdots [y_{l-1}, y_l]$ *(if $l \leq k$ and l is even) (3);*
- $h_4 = g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})[z_{k-l+3}, y_1][y_2, y_3] \cdots [y_{l-1}, y_l]$ *(if $l \leq k$ and l is odd) (4);*
- $h_5 = [g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2}), y_1] \cdots [y_{l-1}, y_l]$ *(if $l \leq k$ and l is odd) (5).*

Proof. Notice that there are two cases to consider: either l is even or l is odd.

- Case 1: l is odd. According to Corollary 10.4, $g_{k-l+2}[z_{k-l+3}, y], [g_{k-l+2}, y] \in T_2(G_{k-l+1})$. On the other hand, we can see that $h_4 \in T_2(G_k)$ (and respectively $h_5 \in T_2(G_k)$) if, and only if, $g_{k-l+2}[z_{k-l+3}, y] \in T_2(G_{k-l+1})$ (and respectively $[g_{k-l+2}, y] \in T_2(G_{k-l+1})$).
- Case 2: l is even. According to Lemma 10.3, $g_{k-l+2} \in T_2(G_{k-l})$. On the other hand, we can see that $g_{k-l+2} \in T_2(G_{k-l})$ if, and only if, $h_3 \in T_2(G_k)$.

□

Corollary 10.7. *Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by the graded identities of type* (3)*. In the free super-algebra $F\langle X\rangle$, we have:*

$$z_1z_2\cdots z_{k-l+2}[y_1,y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1},y_l]\equiv\ a.b\ \ mod\ \ I,$$

where $l\leq k$, l is even, and

- : $a(z_1,\cdots,z_{k-l+2})=(\sum_{|T|\text{is even and non-empty}}-(-2)^{-\frac{|T|}{2}}f_T(z_1,\cdots,z_{k-l+2}))$;
- : $b(y_1,\cdots,y_l)=[y_1,y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1},y_l]$.

Corollary 10.8. *Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by the graded identities of type* (4)*. In the free super-algebra $F\langle X\rangle$, we have:*

$$z_1z_2\cdots z_{k-l+2}[z_{k-l+3},y_1]\cdots[y_{l-1},y_l]\equiv a.b\ \ mod\ \ I,$$

where $l\leq k$, l is odd, and

- : $a(z_1,\cdots,z_{k-l+2})=(\sum_{|T|\text{is even and non-empty}}-(-2)^{-\frac{|T|}{2}}f_T(z_1,\cdots,z_{k-l+2}))$;
- : $b(z_{k-l+3},y_1,\cdots,y_l)=[z_{k-l+3},y_1]\cdots[y_{l-1},y_l]$.

Definition 10.9. *An element $a\in SS$ is labeled as Type-2 (or $u\in SS2$) when:*

- : $deg_Y(\psi(a))\leq k$ *and* $deg_Z(beg(a))+deg_Y(\psi(a))\leq k+1$.

Lemma 10.10. *Let u be an element of SS with the following property:*

$$deg_Z(beg(u))+deg_Y(\psi(u))\geq k+2\ \text{ or }\ deg_Y(\psi(u))=k+1.$$

Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by $[x_1,x_2,x_3]$, the graded identities (1), (2)*, and the graded identities of types* (3) *and* (4)*. For modulo I, u can be written as a linear combination of $SS2$.*

Proof. First, note that if $deg_Y(\psi(u))>k$, then u is a consequence of (1) or (2). In this way, we may assume that $deg_Y\psi(u)\leq k$.

We may suppose without loss of generality that:

$$\begin{aligned}u=y_1^{a_1}\cdots y_{n_1}^{a_{n_1}}y_{n_1+1}^{a_{n_1+1}}\cdots y_{n_2}^{a_{n_2}}z_1^{b_1}\cdots z_{m_1}^{b_{m_1}}z_{m_1+1}^{b_{m_1+1}}\cdots z_{m_2}^{b_{m_2}}[y_{n_1+1},y_{n_1+2}]\\ \cdots[y_{n_1+l},z_{m_1+1}]\cdots[z_{m_2-1},z_{m_2}][z_{m_2+1},z_{m_2+2}]\cdots[z_{l_2-1},z_{l_2}],\end{aligned}$$

where $m_1<m_2<l_2, n_1<n_2<n_1+l; b_1,\cdots,b_{m_2},a_1,\cdots,a_{n_2}>0$ and $deg_Z(beg(u))+deg_Y(\psi(u))=k+2$.

Thus, according to Corollary 10.8:

$$u\equiv a.b.c\ \ mod\ \ I,$$

where

- : $a(y_1,\cdots,y_{n_2})=y_1^{a_1}\cdots y_{n_1}^{a_{n_1}}y_{n_1+1}^{a_{n_1+1}}\cdots y_{n_2}^{a_{n_2}}$;
- : $b(z_1,\cdots,z_{m_2})=(\sum_{|T|\text{is even and non-empty}}-(-2)^{-\frac{|T|}{2}}f_T(z_1,\cdots,z_{m_2}))$;
- : $c(y_{n_1+1},\cdots,y_{n_1+l},z_{m_1+1},\cdots,z_{l_2})=[y_{n_1+1},y_{n_1+2}]\cdots[y_{n_1+l},z_{m_1+1}]\cdots$ $[z_{m_2-1},z_{m_2}][z_{m_2+1},z_{m_2+2}]\cdots[z_{l_2-1},z_{l_2}]$.

Then, after applying the graded identity $[x_1,x_2,x_3]$ to $b.c$, we are done.

When $deg_Z(beg(u))+deg_Y(\psi(u))>k+2$, the proof is similar by inductive arguments. To arrive at this situation, we must replace a by:

$$y_1^{a_1}\cdots y_{n_1}^{a_{n_1}}y_{n_1+1}^{a_{n_1+1}}\cdots y_{n_2}^{a_{n_2}}z_1^{b_1-c}\cdots z_{k_1}^{b_{k_1}},$$

where $k_1\leq m_2, b_{k_1}-c\geq 0$, and $b_1+\cdots+b_{k_1}-c=deg_Zbeg(u)-(k-l+2)$. □

Definition 10.11. *An element $u_i\in SS$ is labeled as Type-*3 *($u_i\in SS3$) when the following conditions hold:*

: $u_i \in SS2$;
: *If* $deg_Z beg(u_i) + deg_Y \psi(u_i) = k+1$, *then* $Deg_{pr(z)(u_i)}\psi(u_i) = 0$.

For lemmas 10.12 and 10.14, we use some of the arguments of Lemma 20-b by [6].

Lemma 10.12. *Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and the graded identities of type* (3). *In the free super-algebra $F\langle X\rangle$, we have:*

$$z_2 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[z_1, z_{k-l+3}][y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \equiv (\textstyle\sum_J \beta_J f_J)[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \ mod \ \ I$$
$$(if\ l \leq k \ and\ l \ is\ even)$$

for some $\beta_J \in F$, $J \subseteq \{1, \cdots, k-l+3\}$. Moreover, if $|J| = 2$, then $1 \notin J$ and $\beta_J = -1$.

Proof. First, note that $[g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], z_{k-l+3}]$ is a graded identity for G_k, because $g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \in T_2(G_k)$. For modulo I:

$$[z_1 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], z_{k-l+3}] + [a[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], z_{k-l+3}] \equiv 0,$$

where $a = \sum_{|T| \text{is even and non-empty}} (-2)^{-\frac{|T|}{2}} f_T(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})$.

It is well known that $[uv, w] = u[v, w] + [u, w]v$ for $u, v, w \in F\langle X\rangle$. Therefore, we conclude that:

$$\begin{gathered}[z_1 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], z_{k-l+3}] \equiv \\ z_1[z_2 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], z_{k-l+3}] + \\ z_2 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l][z_1, z_{k-l+3}] \ \ mod \ \ I.\end{gathered}$$

Thus:

$$\begin{gathered}z_2 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[z_1, z_{k-l+3}][y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \equiv \\ -z_1[z_2 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], z_{k-l+3}] - \\ [a[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], z_{k-l+3}] \ \ mod \ \ I.\end{gathered}$$

Applying successively the graded identity $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and the expression $[uv, w] = u[v, w] + [u, w]v$, we are done. □

Corollary 10.13. *Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by $[x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1^p$ and the graded identities of type* (3).

If $v \in SS2, deg_Z beg(v) + deg_Y \psi(v) = k+1, 2 \mid deg_Y \psi(v), and Deg_{pr(z)v}\psi(v) = 1$, then:

$$v \equiv \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i \ \ mod \ \ I,$$

where $v - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i$ is a multi-homogeneous polynomial, and $v_1, \cdots, v_n \in SS3$.

Proof. Let $v = z_1^{a_1} \cdots z_n^{a_n}[z_1, z_{n+1}][y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l]$ such that $a_1 + \cdots + a_n = k - l + 1; a_1, \cdots, a_n > 0$.

Choose a convenient graded endomorphism ϕ such that $\phi(z_1) = z_1, \cdots,$ $\phi(z_{k-l+2}) = z_n, \phi(z_{k-l+3}) = z_{n+1}$.

For modulo I:

$$\begin{gathered}z_1[\phi(z_1 \cdots z_{k-l+2})[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], \phi(z_{k-l+3})] + \\ z_1[a[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l], \phi(z_{k-l+3})] \equiv 0,\end{gathered}$$

where $a = \sum_{|T| \text{is even and non-empty}} (-2)^{-\frac{|T|}{2}} \phi(f_T(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2}))$.

Following word for word the proof of Lemma 10.12, we conclude that:

$$(a_1)v \equiv z_1(\sum_J \beta_J \phi(f_J))[y_1, y_2]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \ mod \ \ I,$$
for some $\beta_J \in F$, $J \subseteq \{1, \cdots, k-l+3\}$. Moreover if $|J| = 2$, then
$$Deg_{z_1}(\psi(\phi(f_J))) = 0.$$

Generally,
if $v \in SS2, deg_Z beg(v) + deg_Y \psi(v) = k+1, 2 \mid deg_Y \psi(v), \text{and} Deg_{pr(z)v}\psi(v) = 1$, then (by algebraic manipulations):

$$v \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i \ \ mod \ \ I,$$

where $v - \sum_{i=1}^n v_i$ is a multi-homogeneous polynomial and $v_1, \cdots, v_n \in SS3$. □

Lemma 10.14. *Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and the graded identities of type (5). In the free super-algebra $F\langle X\rangle$, we have:*

$$z_2 \cdots z_{k-l+2}[z_1, y_1][y_2, y_3]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \equiv$$
$$(\sum_J \beta_J r_J(z_1, \ldots, z_{k-l+2}, y_1))[y_2, y_3]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \ mod \ \ I \ \textit{(if } l \leq k \textit{ and } l \textit{ is odd)}$$

for some $\beta_J \in F$, $J \subseteq \{1, \cdots, k-l+2\}$. Moreover, if $|J| = 1$, then $1 \notin J$ and $\beta_J = 1$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that demonstrated in Lemma 10.12. In this case, note that due to the graded identities of type (5), we have:

$$[z_1 \cdots z_{k-l+2}, y_1]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l] \equiv a.b \ mod \ I, \text{ where}$$

: $a = [(\sum_{|T| \text{is even and non-empty}} -(-2)^{-\frac{|T|}{2}} f_T(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})), y_1]$;
: $b = [y_2, y_3]\cdots[y_{l-1}, y_l]$ (if $l \geq 3$), or $b = 1$ (if $l = 1$).

□

Corollary 10.15. *Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by $[x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1^p$ and the graded identities of type (5). If $v \in SS2, deg_Z beg(v) + deg_Y \psi(v) = k+1, 2 \nmid deg_Y \psi(v)$, and $Deg_{pr(z)v}\psi(v) = 1$, then:*

$$v \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i \ \ mod \ \ I,$$

where $v - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i$ is a multi-homogeneous polynomial, and $v_1, \cdots, v_n \in SS3$.

As a consequence of Lemmas 10.10, 10.12 and 10.14, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 10.16. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by $[x_1, x_2, x_3], z_1^p, y_1^{pq} - y_1^p$, the graded identities (1), (2), and the graded identities of types (3), (4), and (5). Let $f = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i$ be a linear combination from $Pr(X)$. For modulo I, f can be written as:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m f_i u_i,$$

where $f_1, \cdots, f_m$ are p-polynomials and $u_1, \cdots, u_m \in SS3$ is (are) distinct.

Now, we describe the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of G_k.

10.1. **Main result.**

Theorem 10.17. *Let F be a field of $charF = p > 2$ and $|F| = q$. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of G (with grading induced by ϕ_k) follow from:*

- $[y_1, y_2] \cdots [y_k, y_{k+1}]$ *(if k is odd) (1);*
- $[y_1, y_2] \cdots [y_{k-1}, y_k][y_{k+1}, x]$ *(if k is even and $x \in X - \{y_1, \cdots, y_{k+1}\}$) (2);*
- $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ (3)*;*
- $g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})[y_1, y_2] \cdots [y_{l-1}, y_l]$ *(if $l \leq k$ and l is even) (4);*
- $g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2})[z_{k-l+3}, y_1][y_2, y_3] \cdots [y_{l-1}, y_l]$ *(if $l \leq k$ and l is odd) (5);*
- $[g_{k-l+2}(z_1, \cdots, z_{k-l+2}), y_1] \cdots [y_{l-1}, y_l]$ *(if $l \leq k$ and l is odd) (6);*
- z_1^p *(7);*
- $y_1^{pq} - y_1^p$ *(8).*

Proof. Let I be the T_2-ideal generated by the eight identities reported above. Suppose by contradiction that $I \subsetneq T_2(G_K)$. According to Proposition 10.16, there exists a test polynomial $f = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i u_i$, where $u_1, \cdots, u_n \in SS3 - \{1\}$.

One of the three cases listed below can occur:

- : Case 1: $deg_Z(beg(LT(f))) + deg_Y(\psi(LT(f))) \leq k$;
- : Case 2: $deg_Z(beg(LT(f))) + deg_Y(\psi(LT(f))) = k+1$ and f does not admit a bad term;
- : Case 3: $deg_Z(beg(LT(f))) + deg_Y(\psi(LT(f))) = k+1$ and f admits a bad term.

Case 1. Suppose without loss of generality that:

$$LT(f) = y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_{n_1}^{a_{n_1}} y_{n_1+1}^{a_{n_1+1}} \cdots y_{n_2}^{a_{n_2}} z_1^{b_1} \cdots z_{m_1}^{b_{m_1}} z_{m_1+1}^{b_{m_1+1}} \cdots z_{m_2}^{b_{m_2}}$$
$$[y_{n_1+1}, y_{n_1+2}] \cdots [y_{n_2}, y_{n_2+1}] \cdots [y_{l_1}, z_{m_1+1}] \cdots [z_{m_2-1}, z_{m_2}] \cdots [z_{l_2-1}, z_{l_2}],$$

where $n_1 < n_2 < l_1, m_1 < m_2 < l_2; a_1, \cdots, a_{n_2}, b_1, \cdots, b_{m_2} > 0$.

Suppose that $f = f(y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2})$. Consider the following map :

$$\phi : \{y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2}\} \to G$$

$$\begin{gathered}
y_1 \mapsto \sum_{l=1}^{a_1} e_{k+2l-1} e_{k+2l} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n_1} \mapsto \sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1-1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1}} e_{k+2l-1} e_{k+2l} \\
y_{n_1+1} \mapsto e_1 + \sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1+1}} e_{k+2l-1} e_{k+2l} \\
\cdots \\
y_{n_2} \mapsto e_{n_2-n_1} + \sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2-1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2}} e_{k+2l-1} e_{k+2l} \\
y_{n_2+1} \mapsto e_{n_2-n_1+1} \\
\cdots \\
y_{l_1} \mapsto e_{l_1-n_1} \\
z_1 \mapsto \sum_{l=1}^{b_1} e_{R+l} e_{l_1-n_1+l} \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_1} \mapsto \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1-1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}} e_{R+l} e_{l_1-n_1+l} \\
z_{m_1+1} \mapsto e_{R+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}+1} + \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1+1}} e_{R+l+1} e_{l_1-n_1+l} \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_2} \mapsto e_{R+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+m_2-m_1} + \sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+1}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}} e_{R+m_2-m_1+l} e_{l_1-n_1+l} \\
z_{m_2+1} \mapsto e_{S+1}
\end{gathered}$$

$$\cdots$$
$$z_{l_2} \mapsto e_{S+(l_2-m_2)},$$

where $R = k + 2(a_1 + \cdots + a_{n_2})$ and $S = R + (b_1 + \cdots + b_{m_2}) + m_2 - m_1$.

It is not difficult to see that $(\phi(y_1), \cdots, \phi(y_{l_1}), \phi(z_1), \cdots, \phi(z_{l_2}))$ is a Type-$LT(f)$ sequence.

On the other hand, by Proposition 7.4, $f \notin T_2(G_k)$ which is a contradiction.

Case 2. Consider the following map (in map defined below, we are going to agree on a little abuse of language: $\sum_{l=1}^{b_1-1} e_{k+l+1}e_l = 0$, in the situation that $b_1 = 1$):

$$\begin{gathered}
\phi : \{y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2}\} \to G \\
z_1 \mapsto e_{k+1} + \textstyle\sum_{l=1}^{b_1-1} e_{k+l+1}e_l \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_1} \mapsto \textstyle\sum_{l=b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1-1}}^{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}-1} e_{k+l+1}e_l \\
z_{m_1+1} \mapsto e_{k+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}+1} + \textstyle\sum_{l=1}^{b_{m_1+1}} e_{k+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}+l+1}e_{l+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_1}-1} \\
\cdots \\
z_{m_2} \mapsto \\
e_{k+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+(m_2-m_1)} + \textstyle\sum_{l=1}^{b_{m_2}} e_{k+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}+(m_2-m_1)+l}e_{l+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2-1}-1} \\
z_{m_2+1} \mapsto e_{k+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}+m_2-m_1+1}, \cdots, z_{l_2} \mapsto e_{k+b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}+l_2-m_1} \\
y_1 \mapsto \textstyle\sum_{l=1}^{a_1} e_{M+2l-1}e_{M+2l} \\
y_{n_1} \mapsto \textstyle\sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1-1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1}} e_{M+2l-1}e_{M+2l} \\
y_{n_1+1} \mapsto e_{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}} + \textstyle\sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_1+1}} e_{M+2l-1}e_{M+2l} \\
y_{n_2} \mapsto e_{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}+(n_2-n_1-1)} + \textstyle\sum_{l=a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2-1}+1}^{a_1+\cdots+a_{n_2}} e_{M+2l-1}e_{M+2l} \\
y_{n_2+1} \mapsto e_{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}+n_2-n_1} \\
\cdots \\
y_{l_1} \mapsto e_{b_1+\cdots+b_{m_2}+l_1-n_1-1},
\end{gathered}$$

where $M = k + b_1 + \cdots + b_{m_2} + l_2 - m_1$.

Notice that the sequence $(\phi(y_1), \cdots, \phi(y_{l_1}), \phi(z_1), \cdots, \phi(z_{l_2}))$ is an Almost Type-$LT(f)$ sequence. However, by Proposition 7.5, $f \notin T_2(G_k)$.

Case 3. In this situation, notice that $deg_Z(beg(LBT(f))) + deg_Y(\psi(LBT(f))) \leq k$. Suppose without loss of generality that:

$$\begin{gathered}
LBT(f) = y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_{n_1}^{a_{n_1}} y_{n_1+1}^{a_{n_1+1}} \cdots y_{n_2}^{a_{n_2}} z_1^{b_1} \cdots z_{m_1}^{b_{m_1}} z_{m_1+1}^{b_{m_1+1}} \cdots z_{m_2}^{b_{m_2}} \\
[y_{n_1+1}, y_{n_1+2}] \cdots [y_{n_2}, y_{n_2+1}] \cdots [y_{l_1}, z_{m_1+1}] \cdots [z_{m_2-1}, z_{m_2}] \cdots [z_{l_2-1}, z_{l_2}],
\end{gathered}$$

where $n_1 < n_2 < l_1, m_1 < m_2 < l_2$.

Consider $\phi : \{y_1, \cdots, y_{l_1}, z_1, \cdots, z_{l_2}\} \to G$ as in the Case 1.

It is clear that $(\phi(y_1), \cdots, \phi(y_{l_1}), \phi(z_1), \cdots, \phi(z_{l_2}))$ is a Type-$LBT(f)$ sequence.

On the other hand, by Proposition 7.6, we have that $f \notin T_2(G_k)$. It is a contradiction and we are done.

By checking these three cases, we have $I = T_2(E)$ as required. □

11. Acknowledgements

My sincerely thanks go to my entire doctorate board for their useful comments, remarks and suggestions. Thanks specially to V.R.T. da Silva, a member of my doctorate board, for spotting a flaw in the original proof of Theorem 8.1.

References

[1] Anisimov N. *$\mathbb{Z}_p$-codimension of $\mathbb{Z}_p$-identities of Grassmann Algebra.* Communications in Algebra **29 (9)**, 4211-4230 (2001).

[2] Bekh-Ochir, C. and Rankin, S.A. *The identities and the central polynomials of the infinite dimensional unitary Grassmann algebra over a finite field.* Communications in Algebra **39 (3)**, 819-829 (2011).

[3] Centrone, L. *$\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded identities of the Grassmann algebra in positive characteristic.* Linear Algebra and its Applications **435 (12)**, 3297-3313 (2011).

[4] Chiripov, P.Z. and Siderov, P.N. *On bases for identities of some varieties of associative algebras.* Pliska Studia Mathematica Bulgarica **2**, 103-115 (1981).

[5] Da Silva, V.R.T. *$\mathbb{Z}_2$-codimension of Grassmann Algebra.* Communications in Algebra **37 (9)**, 3342-3359 (2009).

[6] Da Silva, V.R.T. and Di Vincenzo, O.M. *On $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded polynomial identities of the Grassmann algebra.* Linear Algebra and its Applications **431 (1-2)**, 56-72 (2009)

[7] Drensky, V. Free algebras and PI-algebras. Graduate course in algebra, Springer-Verlag, Singapore (1999).

[8] Giambruno, A. and Koshlukov, P.E. *On the identities of the Grassmann algebra in characteristic $p > 0$.* Israel Journal of Mathematics **122**, 305-316 (2001).

[9] Giambruno, A., Mishchenko, S. and Zaicev, M.V. *Polynomial identities on superalgebras and almost polynomial growth.* Communications in Algebra **29 (9)**, 3787-3800 (2001).

[10] Kemer, A.R. Ideals of Identities of Associative Algebras,AMS Translations of Mathematical Monographs. Vol 87 (1987).

[11] Krakovski, D. and Regev, A. *The polynomial identities of the Grassmann algebra.* Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **81**, 429-438 (1973).

[12] Regev, A. *Grassmann algebra over finite fields.* Communications in Algebra **19 (6)**, 1829-1849 (1991).

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Viçosa - Campus Florestal, Rodovia LMG 818, km 06, Florestal, MG, Brazil

E-mail address: luisfelipe@ufv.br